



# THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER IN INDIA

BY

BERNARD HOUGHTON, I.C.S. (RETIRED.)

---

They never fail who die in a great cause :  
The block may soak their gore;  
Their heads may sodden in the sun;  
Their limbs be strung to city gates and castle walls—  
But still their spirit walks abroad.

—LORD BYRON.

---

~~1924~~

---

SUNSHINE PUBLISHING HOUSE  
ENGINEER BUILDING, PRINCESS STREET, BOMBAY.

---

1924.

---

PRINTED BY MARMADUCE PICKHALL AT THE "BOMBAY  
CHRONICLE" PRESS, 143, MEDFORD STREET,

PORT, BOMBAY.

PUBLISHED BY PUNCHING PUBLISHING HOUSE, PUNCHING  
BUILDING, PRINCE'S STREET, BOMBAY.

---

RIGHTS RESERVED.

## AUTHOR'S FOREWORD.

Various as are the articles now reprinted, they are all strung on one thread. They deal with the present political conflict in India, a conflict which has lasted long years, and the end of which is not yet in sight. That conflict is in essence a struggle for power between the English bureaucracy and the capitalists who stand behind them on the one hand, and the people of India on the other. Stripped of verbiage and sonorous but empty phrases, it is that and nothing more. In such a struggle it is folly to imagine that the ruling class will ever be argued out of power, or that some fair day, with a grand gesture, they will relinquish power of their own accord. History gives us no precedents for anything of the kind. A ruling class abdicates only when it deems it more perilous to resist than to submit. If the people are weak, it represses all pleas for freedom as sedition. If they are stronger it must perforce hearken to their prayers. In that case it may grant boons to entice to its side some of its adversaries, or it may make promises to buy off their hostility. But the promises are of gold at the rainbow's foot, and once the danger is overpast, the boons may be modified or altogether revoked.

Nevertheless, it is an error to suppose that the members of a ruling class consciously deceive. A few of the baser sort may do so, but the great majority are honest men according to their lights. As, for instance, the French nobles before the Revolution, they are frequently upright, brave and amongst themselves courteous. The

majority really believe themselves to be friends of the people, really believe that they alone are capable of governing them. The better education which they take care to keep to themselves shakes this belief, but it is founded on class interests and class or group suggestion. Modern psychology demonstrates that the Unconscious Mind consistently rationalises its desires, that is to say, it finds reasons for wishes already formed. In this process of rationalisation it is extremely subtle. The individual in his conscious mind, believes himself to be acting at the dictation of pure reason, whereas all the time he is the slave of the unconscious wishes. Two of the most powerful impulses of the Unconscious are *egoism* and *love* or

the strongest vagaries of the Anglo-Indian Press, just as it explains the neuroses which end in lunacy, or as medical science explains the causes of plague or malaria. Viewed from the high social standpoint, a ruling class must indeed be considered as mentally unsound.

Without exception, in every subject people which has struggled for political freedom, a section has allied itself with the foreign conquerors. This section is composed partly of those directly paid from the public revenues, such as soldiers, civil servants, clerks etc., partly of capitalists and landlords who fear less from their masters than from the people, and partly of well-meaning idealists who think that freedom can be won step by step through argument and persuasion. These latter, reformists in tactics, never succeed in winning freedom, but they always hope that they will do so. They usually have a robust faith in words, a faith armour-plated against a hundred disillusionments. In practice, without the least intending it, indeed intending the exact opposite, they form the main buttress and support of the foreign domination in their land.

• Finally, the need is expressed in these pages of a really democratic India. If Swaraj really means the government of the people by Indian capitalists and the higher castes, if it results only in the transfer of power from a tiny class of foreigners to a tiny class of Indians, it will be but Dead Sea fruit in the mouths of the great



# CONTENTS.



CHAP.	PAGE.
I. Reform in India .. .. .	1
II. The Snare of Diarchy .. .. .	25
III. The Council and the People .. .. .	27
IV. Forward .. .. .	33
V. How England sees India and Burma .. .. .	39
VI. The Way of Fear .. .. .	45
VII. Freedom of Speech .. .. .	50
VIII. The Evil of the System .. .. .	55
IX. Committees and Commissions .. .. .	60
X. The State and the People .. .. .	67
XI. The Turn of the Wheel .. .. .	73
XII. The Lost Faith in Liberty .. .. .	79
XIII. All Power to Wealth .. .. .	85
XIV. Equal Rights and Equal Duties.. .. .	91
XV. Removal of Untouchability .. .. .	102
XVI. Leaders of Labour .. .. .	108
XVII. The Bolshevist Bogey .. .. .	114
XVIII. The Brotherhood of India .. .. .	120





# THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER IN INDIA.

---

## CHAPTER I.

---

### REFORM IN INDIA.

On November 17, 1919, the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons appointed to consider the Government of India Bill presented its report. The amendments it proposed to the bill were accepted *en bloc* by the Coalition Government, without the alteration of even a comma. The bill so amended passed the House of Commons on December 5 and, being approved by the House of Lords, became law before the Christmas holidays. This fact lends special weight to the report of the committee, in which are discussed not only the provisions of the bill but also the principles which should guide Parliament, the Secretary of State, the Government of India and the

provincial governments under the new constitution. Though the constitution is avowedly a transitional one, and though, with a changed Government at Whitehall, its years may be even fewer than its authors anticipate, the report is yet a historical document of the first magnitude.

The key to the new policy was announced on August 20, 1917, by Mr. Montagu as Secretary of State, and this the committee has taken care to embody in the preamble *try* to the act. The essential portions are as follows :

Whereas for the purpose of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the Indian Administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the Empire, it is *x* expedient that substantial steps in this direction should be taken, and whereas

progress in this direction can only be achieved by successive stages :

And whereas the time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament, upon whom responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples :

The wording of the preamble has been closely scrutinized in India and not without reason. Though at first sight merely embodying that caution in advance and dislike of general principles characteristic of the Englishman, it discloses on examination the clash between two opposing schools of thought. In "self-governing institutions" and "responsible government"--the keynotes--democracy speaks. But the modifying clauses kill all the grace and virtue of her speech. Such expressions as "gradual development" and "progressive realisation" may be used to excuse any delay, to stifle progress and to justify the most reactionary policy. They

Contrast the preamble of this act with that of the United States law of 1914 for the government of the Philippines. Does not the former betray the authoritarian mind? Does it not breathe the spirit of the schoolmaster who permits some loosening of the bonds of discipline but warns his pupils that any further relaxation will depend on

their good conduct, of which he himself is to be the sole judge? On the other side see the spirit of freedom, treating the Filipinos as equals, promising them complete independence and avowing that the object of the law is but to enable them better to enjoy that independence. Section 3 of the United States law contains provisions of the last importance in the nature of declaration of rights. In the Indian act no such provisions occur. The omission is intentional. Would not a declaration of rights destroy arbitrary power? Would it not cut at the root of the Rowlatt Act, the Press Act, the Meetings Act and a host of other like restrictions under which India now groans? To-day, though there may be freedom for the British in India, there is none for the Indian. "I will trust the people with the custody of their liberty," said Charles I, "but I will trust no people with the custody of any liberty other than their own, whether that people be Rome, Athens or Britain." That

truth is as yet ungrasped by the British Parliament.

The Indian act hinges on the scheme of dyarchy for the provincial governments. By this plan the functions of government are divided into two classes, reserved and transferred. The reserved subjects remain under the control of the governor and his executive council of four. Two of the councillors will be Indians, but, since the governor will nominate them, they will not be influenced by the legislative assembly and may easily be entirely out of sympathy with it. The transferred subjects will be in charge of Indian ministers nominated by the governor from the assembly and possessing the confidence of the majority of its members. Ministers and councillors will meet in consultation, but each will be responsible only for his own department. Where their views clash, the governor will act as arbitrator. He will decide on the allocation of funds to the different departments. In certain cases

he may override the assembly. Obviously such duties will demand a high degree of tact, firmness and sympathy with democratic ideas. Of the legislative assemblies not less than 70 per cent are to be elected, and not more than 20 per cent are to be officials. But the Southborough Committee, which dealt with the composition of the assemblies and with the franchise, was greatly influenced by the officials, now as always hostile to democracy. The franchise it recommended would include only 5 per cent of the population and would leave wholly unrepresented the working classes, who in Bombay and elsewhere work and live under terrible conditions. This matter the Joint Committee has rightly referred back for further report. Unfortunately, it has accepted the equally unstatesmanlike report of the Functions Committee, which limits the transferred subjects to education, sanitation and some minor departments and leaves with the officials the important item of land revenue.



The Indian National Congress and the Moslem League have declared for complete provincial autonomy.

J The Government of India, the citade of bureaucracy, remains in effect unshaken. True, the act sets up an Assembly of 120 members, 80 to be elected, and a Council of State of 60 members, not more than 20 of whom shall be officials. At least three members of the Executive Council, less than half, will be Indians, but Indians nominated by the Viceroy, not responsible to the people. And the Viceroy, overriding the Assemblies, may sanction any expenditure and pass any law he considers fit. He therefore retains in full the arbitrary powers which he has exercised hitherto by means of the official *bloc*. In the important matter of the budget it is recommended that when the Viceroy and Assemblies agree, the Secretary of State shall not set their views aside ; and since the fiscal policy of India has been ordered up to now not in the interests of that country

but of Great Britain, this recommendation marks a real step in advance.

The final constitution of India will and must be a federation, though the states of the federation may differ from the existing provinces. Of such a federation the Council of State now set up may easily form the Senate and the Legislative Assembly the House of Representatives. But for the moment this question is untouched. Because federation implies real autonomy and freedom from official control, officials look askance at the idea, using the awkward word "central" instead of federal to describe the Simla Government. Indians, on the other hand, are intent on developing the new-born sense of national unity and patriotism. They wish to weld and knit together the differing peoples of India, to lower the barriers dividing province from province. But national unity once firmly established, they will certainly resolve on a federal constitution, the only

constitution that gives scope for local life, local initiative and local patriotism.

The constitution framed by the committee and passed by the Coalition Government is in several respects in advance of the original proposals of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. Why is this? Why should a committee the majority of whom were Conservatives, and a Government which is in reality though not in name a Conservative Government—a party that has ever upheld authority and hated freedom—have stood in this matter of the Indian constitution for real progress? What, too, was the reason for the strange haste with which the measure was pushed through Parliament? The answer is that it was a question of expediency. India was dangerously disturbed, seething with discontent; it was expedient, nay imperative, to apply quick palliatives. The delay in fulfilling the promise of August 20 had indeed fostered discontent, but it was not that discontent which spurred on the committee and the

Government. Deeper matters agitated the Indian mind ; fierce currents surged beneath the surface. India during the war had remained loyal to the British flag. Believing that the war was waged for liberty, for justice and for the rights of peoples to govern themselves, she supported freely the cause of the Allies with men and food and, so far as her poverty allowed, with money. For reward she received the Rowlatt Act. This act, which aimed to perpetuate the arbitrary powers exercised during the war, came to India as a slap in the face. Every man felt himself in fetters, his future progress threatened, himself and his belongings at the mercy of officials and informers. After the act had been passed by the Legislative Council, in the teeth of the opposition of all its Indian members, an agitation against it sprang up throughout the country. The chief form that this agitation took was *Satyagraha* or passive resistance, a movement led by Mr. Gandhi, a man revered throughout India as a saint. There was in it nothing

sedition, nothing dangerous to public order. But officialdom saw danger where no danger was. In the Punjab, already disturbed by the despotic war measures of the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, two popular leaders were interned, whilst Mr. Gandhi who was coming to smooth matters over, was suddenly turned back. At Amritsar a crowd of peaceful petitioners was fired on by troops. The people were infuriated; they killed two Europeans; they burnt buildings. Two days of peace followed, and then General Dyer perpetrated the shocking massacre at the Jallianwallah Bagh. A quiet crowd, assembled to denounce outrage, was butchered by rifle fire without a shadow of warning or of provocation. When the troops had exhausted their cartridges, 500 dead and dying men littered the ground, and 1500 wounded were left uncared-for and untended. Never before, except in Ireland, has the British name been sullied by a crime so black. Other, if minor atrocities, followed elsewhere in the Punjab, where for

a time there ruled a reign of terror. The Indian Government not only condoned all these atrocities, but it suppressed by every means in its power a knowledge of the facts. When, against its will, the Hunter Commission—an inadequate and partial commission—was sent out to inquire, it hastened to pass an act of indemnity to shield the perpetrators. But though no overt reference to the horrors of the Punjab pierced the mist of the censorship, word of what had been done passed through India, and there welled up a hatred of the British such as had never before been known. Simla was alarmed and with reason. It became expedient not only to appease the popular discontent but to appease it quickly. The National Congress was due to meet at this very town of Amritsar on December 27. It was essential that when met it should find in being a liberal measure of reform. Hence the unexpected improvement in the original scheme, hence, too, the speed with which Government hastened to translate its measure into law. Incredible

as it may seem, it was not till after the India Bill had passed the House of Commons that the Amritsar massacre became known to the British public. Otherwise even the present House might have repudiated the doctrine that Simla is "responsible" to London alone and not to the people of India.

The National Congress met at Amritsar. It was a wonderful meeting, a land-mark in the history of India. Though the speakers were righteously indignant at the atrocities in the Punjab, their indignation was tempered by statesmanship and a breadth of view that augurs well for the future. They condemned the crimes of the government but they condemned also the outrages by the mob. Resolutions were passed demanding the recall of Lord Chelmsford and an impartial inquiry into the conduct of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer and others responsible for the reign of terror. Though the reforms were characterized as inadequate, it was agreed to co-operate in working them. Finally

the Congress declared for complete provincial autonomy, dyarchy in the Government of India and a Declaration of Rights. In these resolutions the Moslem League, at a separate meeting, concurred.

A dramatic incident interrupted the sittings of the Congress—the arrival of the Ali brothers and of other political suspects who had been interned under *lettres de cachet*. They were welcomed with tears of joy and thankfulness. A statesmanlike order of the King—pleasantly described in the Anglo-Indian press as a stab in the back for the Viceroy by the Secretary of State—had procured the release of the great majority of these victims of despotic rule as well as the cancellation of numerous securities under the Press Act. Since the passing of this act in 1910, 350 presses and 300 newspapers have been penalized, 500 publications proscribed, security to the extent of over £ 40,000 demanded—think what that means in a poor country like India—whilst 200



presses and 130 newspapers have been prevented from starting. This order of the King has done much to appease Indian opinion, exasperated to a dangerous pitch by the Punjab atrocities and by official repression. It has smoothed the way for the reforms. But, as at the time of the American Stamp Act, England has relaxed her rule on the ground of expediency. The principle remains; the coercion acts have not been repealed. The Government still retains those tyrannical powers which it has used to its own dishonor and to the lasting injury of the Indian people.

So with a burst of sunshine ended the year 1919, a year memorable in India for the Punjab atrocities, the Reform Act and the Amritsar meeting of the Congress ; memorable still more for the marvellous growth in Indian unity and Indian patriotism. Dissensions have broken out between the main or Nationalist Party and the Moderates, led by Mrs. Besant. The two parties differ chiefly in this, that, whereas the Nationalists denounce

the reforms as inadequate and demand self-government as a matter of right, the Moderates hail them thankfully as a boon and are eager to co-operate with the officials. The latter have not been slow to meet these advances. On the important committee nominated to frame rules under the Reform Act no member of the Nationalist party, but only Moderates, have been appointed.

Apart from these dissensions the Khilafat agitation has illumined the growing sense of unity between Hindus and Mohammedans. The future of the Kalifa is a purely religious question ; it interests, moves and inflames only the followers of Islam. Yet the Hindus have throughout sympathized deeply with their fellow citizens ; they have supported them, helped them, indeed have acted almost as if it were a tenet of their own religion which was at stake. That is a fact for the wise to ponder. It is no longer possible to govern India, as Sir B. Fuller and others hoped, on the principle of *divide et impera*,

to play off Mohammedan against Hindu. India is one.

The report of the Hunter Commission, the Dyer debates in the House of Commons, and still more the support of General Dyer by the great majority of the white population in India have had grave results. As by a lightning flash Indians have beheld the real mind of those who rule them and of their sympathizers in Britain. The report is looked on as so much whitewash. Confidence in British justice is weakened, faith in the goodwill of Simla destroyed, and a wall of hatred set up between the two races.

During the autumn of the year events in India have taken a new and ominous course. The breach of faith in the treaty imposed on Turkey, the failure to redress the Punjab outrages, the language used by many English both in India and England, and especially in the Houses of Parliament, concerning those outrages, the manifest intention of the Government of India in the rules framed

under the act to retain as far as possible all power in the hands of the officials, together with the nomination of civilians to four out of the five new governorships and as presidents of all the councils—these facts have broken the faith of most Indians in British justice. This feeling Mr. Gandhi has crystallized in the non-co-operation movement, a movement similar in scope and aim to that of Sinn Fein in Ireland, but resolved to avoid scrupulously all acts of violence. The intention is to boycott not merely the new councils, but by a series of graduated measures, the British government itself, and, by rendering its rule impossible, to compel it to accede to the demands of the people. At a special meeting of the Indian National Congress held at Calcutta under the presidency of Lajpat Rai, Mr. Gandhi's motion was carried by a large majority on September 10. The speeches struck a sterner and more resolute note than any heretofore. At the moment of writing none can say how far the movement will go or what will be the result. One

thing is certain. It is a decisive event in the history of India. By this revolution Indians have resolved to win their freedom not by the favor or with the assistance of the British government, but relying on themselves alone, their numbers, their organization, their self-sacrifice, their courage and their patriotism.

What of the future? Will the reforms work well in practice? Will they satisfy the Indian people? The omens are not good. Admittedly they do not content the great majority of organized opinion, nor is it very likely that their working will greatly assuage the heart-burnings and soften the bitterness so widely felt to-day. Much will depend on the governors. They are the keystone of the new edifice of political reform. If they side too much with the officials, if they flout or ignore popular opinion, feeling will again run high, and feeling in India must now be taken into account very seriously. Three hundred million human beings are politically awake and have begun to move. They may be guided, controlled by

sympathy and statesmanship, but they cannot be checked without disaster. Will the great body of the Civil Service show a new mind and work the new constitution in a democratic spirit? It seems unlikely. Their whole training is not democratic but authoritarian. They turn their eyes to the past for precedents; they are blind to the warnings of the present and fearful of a future of self-government. Already Simla has given a hint of its intentions in the appointment of the Rules Committee. It intends to throw itself into the arms of the Moderates, to spurn the Nationalists who form the great majority of the Indian people. Still more significant is the budget for 1920-1. A year and a half after the end of the war the Government sets aside £ 40,000,000 out of a total of £ 90,500,000 for the army. It alleges the need for new equipment. But that is not the real reason. The real reason is that it fears the people and hopes to overawe them by artillery, tanks, aeroplanes and great munitions of war. Fear is the mainspring

of the Government's policy. It is based on fear, inspired by fear, bound by fear. Is that the spirit which can meet the problems of modern India with any hope of success? It is the old bureaucratic spirit, the spirit of privilege and precedent and aloofness from popular wishes and hopes. No protestations, no "camouflage" will alter this essential fact.

Against this government of privilege, resting on bayonets, stand the embattled people of India, united, confident, inspired. For leaders they have statesmen of the first rank, such as Mr. Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Patel, the Ali brothers and a host of others. India is at heart the most peaceful country on earth, and therefore the struggle will be peaceful. But struggle there will be. If a Labor Ministry succeeds the present Coalition (really Conservative) Government in England, the conflict will be short. Otherwise it may linger on through years of agitation, disaffection, compromise and growing popular power. The end is certain.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE SNARE OF DIARCHY.

---

DIARCHY, it must be repeated, will not work. It depends entirely on the idea of co-operation between the officials and the people. The idea involves a certain confusion of thought. Co-operation means working together for a common end or aim? Here, what is the aim? For the people it is plain enough,—Home Rule, that is to say, freedom. But is that the aim for which the officials work? If it be Home Rule, then their acts and words have singularly belied their real intent. Have they ever, of their own free will and without pressure, done a single act to further the freedom of the people? Have they not rather striven to bind them in tighter and tighter fetters? Look at S. 144 Cr., P. C. the Rowlatt Act, the Press Act, the Meetings Act; look at the persecution of the popular leaders and the open enmity



to the popular movement. Every act, every word declares their dislike of popular power and shows undeniably their intention to stave off the day when the people shall be free. We are now seriously asked to believe that on the passing of the Reform Bill, the officials will suddenly turn round and cast aside all their traditions and work hand-in-hand with the ministers for freedom. Only children will believe this fairy tale.

True, in India the Assemblies have worked harmoniously enough. Why? Because they are manned by Moderates, and the moderates have become the tools of the officials. On their lips is a little criticism and they mouth for the fine phrases, but when it comes to deeds, they follow meekly at the official heel. In official eyes no doubt that is co-operation, but the people think differently. They call it betrayal.

You can have compromise on details such as the rules under an Act or the items

under a major head in the Budget, but on questions of principle compromise there can be none. One or other of the contending parties must impose its will. In India the issues are plainly set so that all men may see,—bureaucratic government or government by the people, despotic rule or liberty. From the nature of the case there can be no one half-way house ; the fight must go on to victory. No fair words or sounding phrases or vague promises can alter one jot the essential clash of ideals.

Will any official, any responsible official come forward and say : “ I believe that the Indians have a right to govern themselves. I hold that self-government is better than government by foreigners, however well-meaning. I will do all in my power to hasten the day when India shall govern herself.” You know very well that no official will say these things. They cannot say them because they do not believe them,—in fact they believe the exact contrary. How

then can they co-operate with the representatives of the people ? Will they not, instead of accelerating Swaraj do their utmost to delay it in like manner as they have delayed diarchy?

Diarchy, then, is by its nature unworkable, or rather it is only workable if the ministers and the Assembly forswear the liberty of their country and truckle to the officials. As a plan to blunt the edge of the popular resentment, it has its advantages, but reviewed as a ground work for true democracy, it is a snare, and is bound to fail.

Enough of shams. Let us concentrate on realities. India wants freedom. Without Swaraj, freedom she cannot have; therefore on Swaraj and nothing else must she set her heart.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### THE COUNCIL AND THE PEOPLE.

---

We have now three schools of thought in India, those who would boycott altogether the new Council, those who would use it as a means to wring Swaraj from a hostile Government, and those who would work in it in harmony or co-operation with the Government. All desire Swaraj, but whilst the members of the last class believe that Government will itself grant a free constitution, the members of the other two classes hold that it will never give Home Rule of its own will but only when compelled by the force of public opinion and of a strong agitation.

The two first classes are divided merely on the question of tactics. They both believe that India has the right to govern herself here and now, that she is capable of governing

3

herself and that such government will indeed be vastly superior in many ways to official rule. They both hold diarchy to be unsound in theory, because it would link together in one government parties, that is the officials and the people, who hold fundamentally different views and who have entirely divergent aims. They both agree that in practice diarchy has proved a fraud and a delusion since all real power is retained by the officials through their spokesman, the Viceroy. They both are of opinion that specious words notwithstanding, the Indian bureaucracy will as hitherto block every step forward of the people to self-government and will yield only to compulsion. The difference of opinion is solely whether the officials can be more quickly compelled to grant Home Rule by a boycott of the Councils or by entering the Councils and either fighting there as did Parnell in the British Parliament, or by ignoring the Councils after election as did Sinn Fein. The difference in short is

simply one of *method*, on all matters of *principle* the two parties are as one.

Far different is it with the third party. The members of this party accept diarchy both in theory and practice, they take entirely the official view, they would work diarchy as the officials work, they are in a word on the official side. Few in number, they derive importance solely from support they receive from the officials, who strive to represent them as "the better mind" or "the saner opinion" of India and to magnify their numbers. Obviously, too, they will receive all the lucrative appointments in the power of the officials to bestow. If they feel themselves cut off from the national life of their country, they may take comfort from the thought that :—

The jingling of the guinea  
Helps the hurt that honour feels.

The great majority of the Indian people stand entirely apart from this class, whom

in plain language they consider to be either dishonest or very foolish. If they accept diarchy in order to obtain official favour or secure fat appointments for themselves they are dishonest. If they accept it from faith in the promise of August 1917 they are certainly very foolish. For that promise—so vaguely worded as to give a loophole to any and every evasion—was simply a “war promise,” that is, it was made by the governing class of Britain at the time when it was hard pressed and felt doubtful whether it would win the objects—the real not the ostensible objects—for which it was waging war. It is worth precisely as much as the other promises such as “making the world safe for democracy,” “homes for heroes,” “the liberty of small nations” etc., etc., made during the same period. The world has been made safe not for democracy but for plutocracy; for homes, the heroes are invited to emigrate to the colonies, (which do not want them). If you would learn the victors’ zeal for national freedom, go

and enquire in Ireland or Egypt or Syria or Iraq. No, the bulk of the Indian people are not fools, they see and hear and judge by the actual facts.

Apart from this small class, all Indians are really at one. They are one in opinion, they are one in principle ; they are one in aims. The sole difference is re the best method to obtain their common purpose. This surely is a question for the majority to decide. Whatever course seems to them best, after full and fair consideration, the minority ought in all loyalty to accept. That is the essence of successful party warfare, exactly as it is vital in armed conflict between nations. Without such consideration and mutual concessions no party can hold together or win power. With it the battle is ours.

One more word. What is the sense of recrimination or personal attacks? Are we not all united as brothers in the great cause



of freedom for India. The very nobility of our cause should raise us above all personalities and purify us from jealousies. If others hold different views as to the best method to adopt, what has that to do with them personally? Are they not fellows with us, comrades in the same cause, soldiers in one army? Convince them—if you can—by persuasion. Persuasion consists, not in personalities, but in appeals to reason and facts. Let us leave such attacks to the enemy who we may be very sure will make them, enough and to spare. If persuasion fails, if the majority hold other opinions than our own, we should still without bitterness or ill-feeling continue in the ranks of the national army, content to bear the burden and to aid our comrades and to do all that in us lies to further the cause of Indian liberty.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### FORWARD !

---

We fight for Swaraj because bureaucracy substitutes the rule of the drill sergeant for a living, glowing national life, because it paralyses initiative and atrophies the judgment, because it binds men and women in the chains of materialism, because it is spiritual death. Conquered it must be, for so long as it exists a new life for India is impossible.

A new life ! Yes, that and nothing less is what the Nationalist Party stands for. First the barriers which check all real progress must be broken down. This is essential, but it is only a preliminary, so to speak, a kind of negative work. The real, the constructive work remains behind. We intend not only to loose the bonds, but to open out new ways to the freemen of India to inspire them with great ideals, to point them to the stars. It

is the ideal, the aim which a man sets before him which decides his destiny. Woe to the individual or to the nation, it has been said, that makes mediocrity his goal! If a man pitches his aims high, if he believes in himself and is energetic, be assured that he will surprise not only his neighbours but be an ornament and a pride to his country. The ground of our faith is belief in the divinity of men. Because people are now uneducated, or having received a mediocre education are content to plod along in the old, dreary, conventional path, that is no test of what they can do if they will. All history, all psychology proves that the average man barely does a hundreth part of what he is really capable. Take merely the number of hours a man usually workes each day,— say seven or eight. Experience in the war proved again and again that men, aye and women, could double this period with impunity. Many of the world's greatest men do and have done so with no spur beyond their own keenness and energy. "There is no

fun like work" said Sir T. Lipton. The fact is that what tires a man is not work, but mental conflict. If the conscious mind strives to do work, while the unconscious is all the time wishing to get away to some other occupation or to indulge in day dreaming, a sense of fatigue and dullness soon supervenes. But call in the imagination, train the unconscious and all weariness vanishes. The two parts of the mind work in harmony, imagination re-inforces reason, and all emotions are directed to the self-same goal. That is the secret of the success of all great men, as it is the secret of genius. Modern psychology applied to teaching shows how each pupil may attain the grandest results, not by straining nor by irksome toil, but joyously as it were, by his own volition.

In free India purged of the deadly poison of race subjection, loose from the swaddling bands of official control, the schools will go boldly forward, they will become the nurseries of a new nation. To

those who dare to think, nothing is impossible. It is not enough to free ourselves of official chains, we must free ourselves also of all that suffocating mass of superstitious, narrow ideas, strangling conventions, which fetters our progress and smothers our intellect. Every man, declared Noyce, is heir to an empire, but has fallen into a pit. We must climb not only out of the pit but up to the mountain tops where the air is serene and pure and great horizons open before our eyes. The world is full of new and noble ideas, the presage of a great era. Still overclouded by militarism, by race and class hatreds and all the selfishness begotten by the strength for wealth, the sun of brotherhood has risen and begins to break through the sinister shadows of the night. The time is nearer than many think, when war will be even as cannibalism is now, and the "Statesmen" whether in England, France, Germany Austria or Russia who begot the late war be regarded as so many criminal lunatics.

But it is to the individual that the first great step forward is possible. To every Indian we may say:—Because your father worked unintelligently is no reason why you should work unintelligently. Because his thoughts were limited to the field or the shop is no reason why you should not aspire to all knowledge, from the majestic movements of the universe of stars to the tiny dance of the electrons. Because he hoped for nothing more than a life of humdrum toil is no reason why you should not strive to be a Newton or a Darwin, a Cobden or a Mazzini. For women there is a Florence Nightingale who not only nursed in the squalid hospitals of Gallipoli, but afterwards against the bitter opposition of the Conservatives and many medical men of her day, transformed Hospital management and halved the sickness in the army. All careers are possible, nothing is refused to him who with high aims, throws himself, will and reason and imagination, into his work. But let it be work that is socially

good, that makes for the welfare and the enlightenment of his fellows. Let social service and not individual greed be the test and standard of his activities. That way alone shall lie real happiness and the solace of his days.

This then is the supreme task of Nationalism. To rouse the millions from their apathy to hearten them with new hopes, to point out to each what he or she is capable of with energy and with zeal, in a word, to inspire. All the world is open, all the world of science, of art, of wondrous inventions of noble and glorious ideals. Nationalism will swing open the door and to the myriads, dull, careworn, oppressed, cry "Here is a new life. Here is your heritage".

## CHAPTER V.

### HOW ENGLAND SEES INDIA AND BURMA ?

---

It cannot be too often reiterated that the average Englishman, when he can be induced to turn his eyes to India or Burma, sees things, not as they are, but as the Anglo-Indian pictures them. With the exception of the "Daily Herald"—a paper which the Simla Government, characteristically enough, shuts out from India—all papers are the easy tools of the Anglo-Indians, they see only with their eyes, they hear only with their ears. They present matters in fact very much as papers like the "Rangoon Gazette," the "Madras Mail" or the "Englishman" present them.

Here for instance is an example from the "Times." Now-a-days that paper is shorn of much of its ancient, prestige, it is no



longer looked on as 'the thunderer,' but it yet stands in impartiality above the average of English papers. In a telegram dated the 23rd, January on the position in India and Burma it alleges (1) that "Indian agitators are working up the Burma masses to a purely artificial political discontent," and (2) that "there is a widespread desire to see the reforms advocated in the Whyte Report put into effect as soon as may be." This is the kind of "news" which the English public receives about Burma! This is what Englishmen read when they wish to form a judgment on Burman affairs. The next thing we may expect to hear is that the G. C. B. A. has elected Mg. Po Bye as President or has presented a vote of thanks to Sir R. Craddock for his labours in the cause of political freedom.

Such a travesty of fact would be ludicrous were its consequences not grave. This perversion of news, be it remembered, goes on persistently, consistently from day to day,

year in and year out. The "Times" is relatively moderate if there can be such a thing as moderation, where all are entirely on one side, the side of the Anglo-Indians. The "Daily Telegraph," the "Daily Mail" and the "Morning Post" are far worse. They teem with abuse of Indians, of "extremists," of agitators in general and Mahatma Gandhi in particular. The picture presented has no relation to the reality than a dream of the night to the events of the day.

Exactly the same burlesque of the facts occurred in the recent Irish history. Irishmen have repeatedly and bitterly complained of the English Press, how it suppressed, invented and distorted news. The wildest lies, such as for instance that the people of Cork burnt their own Town Hall were seriously credited by the governing class, whilst the filthy atrocities of the Black-and-Tans, atrocities which have fouled for all time the British flag, were systematically suppressed or slurred.

over. As for Russia, the press has since the Soviet Revolution erected round it a barrage of lies, so fantastic as to be self-contradictory, yet they are firmly believed by many.

With such a Press it is quite idle for Indians and Burmans to expect justice from the present governing classes in Britain. If Labour comes into power after the General Election, some hope of justice they may have, some hope that England will extend to India and Burma its vaunted principles of freedom and self-government. To expect any such policy now is to cry for the moon. The selfish interests of the Civil and Military services and especially of British merchants manipulate the news and pull the strings. Platitudes and pompous phrases notwithstanding, India and Burma are in the last resort governed for the advantage of these classes.

Some people in India and Burma may still imagine that by being "loyal" *i. e.*

to the Empire, they will receive better treatment. An idle dream. Fine words they may hear, expressions of sympathy, friendliness—as one pats a docile dog—but power, freedom—No. Was not India “loyal” during the War? What was her reward? The Rowlatt Act and Repression. Was not Egypt “loyal”? What reward has she? Broken pledges and Martial Law? Was not Burma “loyal,” both during and afterwards? How was she recompensed? By a deliberate attempt to shut her out from even the poor pretence of Diarchy. As the history of Ireland proves with absolute certainty, Britain never gives away concessions—let alone freedom—to subject races except when it is “expedient” to do so, that is, in plain language unless she is forced to do so by the fear of serious trouble—to her governing classes—unless soon concession is made. Questions of principle do not count. Fear, and fear alone, has been the real cause of every slackening of the bounds, of every

step towards freedom. Fear obtained Grattan's Parliament in 1782, fear begot the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, fear induced the reform of the Land Laws in 1882, finally fear—not only of the Irish Republicans but of Washington—was the real reason of the Treaty of London. The concessions of August 20th 1917 during the War and their practical annulment by rules made after the War merely exemplified in India many an incident in the tragic history of Ireland.

Two essential facts, then Indians and Burmans must bear in mind. Englishmen—outside the readers of the "Daily Herald"—hear Anglo-Indian news and nothing but Anglo-Indian news. Anglo-Indians, official, and non-official control the government, *therefore* freedom will be won when Anglo-Indians consider it less dangerous to give freedom than to refuse it.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE WAY OF FEAR.

---

One hundred years ago England was disgraced by an infamous Penal Code. For even the most trivial offences—the theft of a sheep—the penalty was death by hanging. In fact its framers seemed to have imagined that only by the constant terror of death before their eyes could the people, or rather the poorer classes, be kept in the paths of honesty. When men sought to reform this scandal the Bishops, the Judges, the Lords and most of the wealthy rose up and prophesied ruin and chaos as the result. Repeal of the law came only after a young woman with a child at her breast had been hanged for stealing an article worth five shillings. Needless to say that none of the evils prophesied came to pass. Society far from retrograding, became better, more human, more civilised.

That is only one example amongst hundreds which demonstrate how futile is this policy of fear. Everywhere in Europe during the Middle Ages, when a small caste of nobles and kings maintained against the mass of people an unjust and privileged position, did a system of government by fear prevail. Knowing in their minds that those privileges could not be sustained at the court of reason, they resorted to the dungeon, the torture chamber and the halter in order to keep the people under their yoke. They imprisoned, they racked, they killed by the law or without the law. Millions of men and women were doomed to poverty and hunger in order that in castle or in palace a few might lord it over them in all the luxury then known.

It is even thus. Whenever a class or a race has by war or by the chicanery of politics seized the reins of power, it always reverts to force, that is, to the inculcation of fear, to maintain its usurped authority. It may

endeavour by the spread of sophistries and its inherent excellence, to delude the subjects into acquiescence, make them imagine themselves by nature dolts, and their rulers by nature supermen. Thus the kings and the nobles aforesaid taught the doctrine that they were of blue blood, whatever that might mean, and the common people of baser blood. To-day in Britain the wealthier classes imagine themselves by natural selection superior to the herd of poorer people. But at heart they know these doctrines to be unsound; they know that man-for man, given equal opportunities from birth, they are no better than the people they oppress. Hence it is that they rely not on reason but on hired soldiers.

Wherever in civilised countries you see a class or a race resorting to force to maintain their dominance, you may be pretty sure that that dominance rests not on justice. For if it were so, if the class or race were ruling the others for their good, they would



not require bayonets or cannon to support their claims. Civilised men are reasonable men, and they would quickly recognise the benefits they received,—nay the conservativeness of human nature is such that it is only when the injury done to the people is grievous that they can be moved to action.

But knowledge spreads. The people begin to reason. They are no longer to be deluded by doctrines of the inborn superiority of one race or the inherent baseness of another. Both in India and Burma the people perceive that they are in subjection, not because they are inferior but because they have not been educated. Hence the nervousness of their rulers. Having staved off education as they dared, they now find this policy avails them no longer. Ideas spread ; the veil of darkness is lifted ; the people begin to question, and, questioning, to aspire. The present system of government resorts more and more ruthlessly to force. It presses into its service every discovery

of modern science, it increases (*teste* Lord Esher's Commission) the pay and comforts of the soldier and the police. It kills as at Amritsar without mercy in like manner as did Genghiz Khan or 'Timur the Tartar. In spite of fair words—words which have long ceased to deceive—it shows more and more openly that the real basis of its power is the same as that of the naked savage—Fear. And by that admission the ruling class proclaims at the same time its unfitness to rule over civilised people. For reasoning people are not long to be governed by the methods of fear. Once they realise the wound to their self-respect, they will not rest until that wound is healed. Healed it may never be, save only by freedom. You may drug a man into docility, you may make him imagine himself free when he is only dreaming opiumdreams of freedom, but once he is quit of your drug and awake, he will not rest until he is indeed his own master. You cannot long terrorise an awakened nation, nor hold in chains a people who will to be free.

## CHAPTER VII.

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

---

It was Voltaire who wrote, "I disapprove profoundly of what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to express your opinion." In these words he put in a nutshell the doctrine of freedom of speech. In every society or at least in every progressive society, the ideas of men must differ. They think differently on every subject, on politics, on religion, on economics, on social ideals, on matters of objective science and on matters of spiritual principles. In such diversity who will say where the truth lies? Truth is only to be found after free discussion and the weighing of arguments and the facts adduced on all sides, that is through persuasion. It is independent of authority or of numbers, most certainly of armed might. Because some men are more numerous or are possessed of more deadly weapons, does it follow that their opinions are the true ones? Is there any necessary connection

between truth or right and bombs or quick-firing cannon ?

To judge from the acts of the victorious government in the War one would really think they held that there was such a connection. At least they have with violence pressed opinions contrary to their own in Ireland, Egypt, Syria and India. Their attitude to communism is typical of their attitude in everything. If communism is a wrong doctrine, injurious to society as they hold, the right, the obvious course would be to point out why it is wrong and injurious and to adduce facts and arguments proving this contention. Did they do this? .Not at all. They attempted a " cordon sanitaire " round Russia, in plain words to shut it off by war and blockade ; all news from Russia was strictly censored and a ceaseless barrage of lies set up. Arguments or persuasion there were none.

So also with the nationalist movement in India. Indians urge and adduce cogent

facts and arguments to prove that the Government of India by a foreign bureaucracy has injured and does injure her economically, socially, intellectually, and spiritually. What is the official reply? No real attempt is made to meet these facts and arguments. For the most part they ignored. To call your opponents names such as "extremists" or "agitators" is not to answer their reasoning; it is to revert to the mentality of the savage or the school boy. Nor does imprisonment, even by tens of thousands, prove that you are right; it merely proves that that you have on your side greater military force, a totally different thing.

Those who have a good case do not stoop to such methods. They are the methods of the soldier and the barbarian, and their present vogue is one of the evil results of war. We have all heard the adage "inter arma silent leges." Alas! It is not only law which sinks out of sight in war time: Truth and Justice and Mercy also are blotted out and Reason dies.

Not persuasion but the sword is the arbiter of right.

This war psychosis has come to reinforce the natural trend of the Indian bureaucracy to repress freedom of speech. We say natural, because in the first place all bureaucracies resent criticism or free discussion. It hurts their pride, their self-conceit and their belief in official routine and methods. In the second place founded as is this bureaucracy on conquest, and maintained in power by armed force, it is bound to be infected by the mentality of the soldier, to hold by the doctrine that might is right. The result of this fresh inoculation of war ideas has been disastrous ; the division between the rulers and the ruled in India is no longer a rift ; it is a chasm. If you suppress freedom of speech by force, one of two things will happen. The people may sink into moral and intellectual torpor, as in Russia under the Czars or on the other hand, the very act of repression may rouse them to bolder discus-

sion, may intensify their convictions as happened in Scotland when they persecuted the covenanters, or in Ireland under the Black-and-Tan-Terror. This consequence is what has happened in India and what was bound to happen. Is it likely that a nation, 300 millions strong, which has once glimpsed sweet liberty will ever again bow its neck to the yoke? Is it likely that those who have sat at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi, who have heard the stirring calls to patriotism of Lajput Rai, the Ali Brothers, C. R. Das and a host of other heroes will ever abandon the hope of a national life and of an India re-born? Shall all the suffering and toil and tears of this great struggle for freedom pass away as they had never been? The blindest of officials, the most bigoted of soldiers, might fore-see the certain answer. Forbid speech, gag discussion as you will, India has learnt to think, and she will think. Her thoughts will materialize: To-day she unifies, resolves, plans. To-morrow she will act.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE EVIL OF THE SYSTEM.

---

You can no more talk of average human nature, it has been truly said, than of the average music of an organ, which depends entirely on the hand of the musician. All history, properly considered, bears this out. We see men at one time brave, at another cowardly, at one time cruel, at another humane, now apathetic and ignorant, again eager and cultured. It is not their physical being, their bodies which change. The skin, flesh, muscles, nerves, bones, brains, are exactly as before. If it were possible to place a man of one era side by side with one of the time but little removed, not an iota of difference physically would be seen. The difference is caused by different ideas, whether due to Government or to religion or to culture.

Take the Roman of Imperial Rome. In many ways he was highly civilised. He esteemed art and raised magnificent buildings; his writings will live for centuries yet; his code of law is still the backbone of the



European system ; he maintained law and order amongst many wild peoples and promoted trade. Yet on those not of his class or race, he perpetrated horrible cruelties. His law required that every slave before being examined as a witness should be put to the torture. In the amphitheatres thousands were done to death by wild beasts or in forced combats, and on these brutal spectacles all Rome, even refined ladies gloated their eyes. The scene changes ; a new civilisation reigns and these abominations disappear from under the Italian skies.

At one time the peoples of Asia Minor worship the Roman Gods and think as the Romans do ; at another they are Christians with all the mentality of the Christian Faith ; at another Moslems seeing everything from the Moslem standpoint. So in Egypt with the successive religions of Christianity and of Islam.

The English were Republicans and Puritans under Cromwell : under Charles II.

Monarchists and Churchmen The French in the 19th century repeatedly changed their form of Government, and with it to a great extent their mentality. The Germans are now Socialists, the Russians, the Communists, their every thought poles asunder from what it was a few years ago under the Kaiser or the Czar. Man is the creature of his ideals. Mould his ideals, and you mould the man.

That is what makes the form of Government of such vital importance. A bad system both by its example, by its methods, and by the aims it subserves, may plunge millions into the mire of sloth and ignorance; it might sow broadcast cruelty and brutality, vice and drunkenness, may degrade or delude myriads of men and women. Contrariwise a good system makes for a happy, enlightened, kindly and progressive people. By their fruits you shall know them, by the type of men which they bring forth. Take Sir M. O'Dwyer or General Dyer for instance. Both are typical English gentlemen, and living in England they would behave and think in

the kindly, tolerant way of their class. Yet under the Indian Bureaucracy they gloried in deeds of blood like any Roman Patrician or Spanish Inquisitor. When Sir R. W. Smyth proclaimed the brutal doctrine of racial supremacy, he shocked the gentle Moderates, but he merely said frankly and in plain terms what every one knows is the creed of all Anglo-India. Anglo-Indians are not by nature more arrogant than other men nor are O'Dwyers and Dyers more bloodthirsty. They are what they are, owing to the evil system of Government which begets cruelty and arrogance exactly as slum dwellings beget immorality and drunkenness.

It is idle to rail against individuals. It is the system, the evil of the system which poisons their minds. Whether it be Romans watching men torn by wild beasts, or Aztecs revelling in human sacrifices or Inquisitors burning heretics alive, or Anglo-Indians applauding the massacre of

Amritsar, the true source of the corruption must be sought, not in the men themselves, but in the Government or religion which pollutes and depraves their finer nature. It is the system, not the man which is the criminal. Change that system—diarchy of course is no change from bureaucracy—create a self-governing India, establish equal rights for all with privileges for none, that is Home Rule that is Democracy, and the Englishmen in India, no longer tainted by the poison of race supremacy, will become bright examples of humanity and kindness and courtesy. Equal rights mean good manners and human hearts. For the weal of Englishmen then no less than for the weal of Indians, bureaucracy, that system founded on force, built of inequality and roofed with arrogance must go. It must give place to a system where the people really rule, where all with equal rights work together for the common good, where Reason and Culture join hands with Duty and Freedom. To that day all India presses.

## CHAPTER IX.

### COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS.

---

At first sight it may seem a sensible thing for Government to have appointed a Committee which will investigate the public expenditure and propose reductions. Here is a country so poor that the average yearly income is estimated at only Rs. 14 per head of population, yet the taxation now amounts to Rs. 6-8-0, a sum, too, which has more than doubled within the last seven years. In Asia is profound peace; no foreign foe menaces India ; yet in this time of tranquillity Government has felt itself compelled to impose on its subjects this grievous burden of taxation. It accordingly comes and says : " We will see if this expenditure cannot be reduced and for this end we will have a Committee to scrutinise our outgoings, presided over by one of the most eminent and successful men in the commercial world." That sounds quite reasonable. It appears that the Govern-

ment is really anxious for its financial position and desires to curtail the expenditure which makes this taxation necessary.

But look for a moment at the budget? Are the causes of this mountainous expenditure really obscure? Quite obviously they are not. Nearly 60 per cent of the revenues are absorbed by the army, a truly amazing proportion in a country which, as already pointed out, is threatened by no enemy and which is inhabited by the poorest civilised population in the world. Further, with their poverty and misery the pay of all the higher official posts is fixed on a lavish scale, higher than in any other land. India presents the spectacle in fact of the poorest country in the world, ruled by the best paid officials in the world. There may be, and doubtless are, other items on which expenditure can be reduced with advantage; for instance, the exodus to the hills might be given up. But the army and the high salaries stand foremost, they dominate the entire budget.

No Committee is needed to investigate them and without reductions of the most drastic kind under these heads any recommendations of a Commission will be no more than throwing spoonfuls of water on a raging fire. Both these items which consume the revenues of India depend on policy and it is folly to imagine that any real or substantial reduction is possible unless that policy be changed. The army, as Lord Rawlinson admitted, is required to keep the bureaucracy in power. The high salaries are due—well, when people fix their own wages they are apt to reckon their deservings at rather a tall figure. It is not for a commission to recommend changes of policy; it is for the Government. Will it do so? With the interests of the all-powerful Services against it, with all Anglo-India shouting “safety first” and looking for salvation not through any righteous dealing, but from aeroplanes and machine-guns, it is unlikely that the Government will change its policy. The fact is that ‘Committees are very often a

device to gain time.' Where a Government is in earnest to do a thing, it acts of its own volition without any Committee. When it is not in earnest, but wishes to stave off the people's indignation, it appoints a Committee to "investigate." That takes time and it hopes that by the time the Committee have reported, popular feeling will have cooled and apathy have replaced zeal and passion. Some other event may have happened to draw away the public interest. In any case it can shelter itself behind the findings of the Committee which are not likely to be radical, and in all probability, will not run counter to the Government's policy. Then the whole thing fizzles out in a few petty reforms and the real evil is untouched.

In England at the close of the War, Labour held a very strong position; it held, in many ways, its whip-hand over Capital. Moreover, working men, who furnished the vast majority of the soldiers, had acquired during the war a more independent outlook



and they were encouraged in this by the promises so lavishly made of new and entirely better conditions, "homes for heroes" and so forth. The Coalition Government, it is needless to say, is a Capitalist Government. What did it do? It was necessary to gain time until the first burst of activity required to replace war-damage and war-neglect was passed and a falling market gave Capital the command. Therefore, we had the Coal Commission, the Industrial Conference, an improved education embellished and fortified by more lavish promises. The promises have vanished into thin air on one excuse or another. Nothing was done on the Sankey Report, extremely little on the report of the Industrial Commission, and the Educational Reforms have been largely repealed. The workers find themselves back again in 1900 or so. It is the same old story.

"The devil was ill, the devil a saint  
would be

"The devil was well, the devil a  
saint was he."


The strategy succeeded ; time was gained and workers now ruefully contemplate the wreckage of their hopes.

Indians will recollect the Education Commission in Lord Curzon's time. Lord Curzon was zealous for several things but not for popular education. Therefore when an outcry was raised at the grave neglect of this education, he appointed a Commission to "investigate." In due course this Commission reported, its report was "considered" always a tedious process, and the chief result was a new Simla appointment. Meanwhile its popular clamour had died down. Education was shelved once more.

At the last budget the outcry against taxation was formidable, so great in fact as even to spur the Moderates, the darlings of the Government into action. The Government had no reply beyond the usual 'Sic volo Sic Jubeo' "So I wish and so I command." It was expedient to gain time to enable the universal indignation to cool. With time

•

5



## CHAPTER X.

### THE STATE AND THE PEOPLE.

---

The Indian bureaucracy has never been one with the people. Founded on conquest, maintained by the sword, manned by foreigners, is it strange that it should have remained aloof, without part or lot in the toils and penury, the anxieties and hopes of the common people? And if the District officers with their spacious bungalows and their white men's clubs are in all essentials of life separate from the people over whom they rule, how much more the Government prosper which during the greater part of the year lives at hill stations as remote for all practical purposes as London! With separate life and with separate interests no wonder that the idea has grown up and become firmly fixed of the Government of India as one body totally distinct from the people of the land. It is in India but not of India.

Rather it resembles a tentacle stretched out from Britain resting on India and holding her a prisoner to the commands of the London Cabinet. What Sir Donald Wallace writes of the Russian officials under the Czars is strictly true of the English bureaucracy: "The officials systematically treated those over whom they were placed as a conquered or inferior race. The State thus came to be regarded as an abstract entity with interests entirely different from those of the human beings composing it."

"With interests entirely different!" All in India whether rulers or ruled will recognise how accurately this describes the situation. It is the interest of the people to have universal education; it is the interest of the officials to keep them ignorant and therefore docile; it is the interest of the people to have only an army sufficient for internal order and to guard the best natural frontier in the world; it is the interest of the officials to maintain a large army to overawe

the people ; it is the interest of the people to be united and patriotic ; it is the interest of the officials to 'divide and rule.' And so on through excise, trade, everything which concerns the life and progress of the nation ; the interests of rulers and ruled confront each other in tragic antagonism.

Without identity of interest, identity of will is impossible. Hence the clash of ideas which we see throughout India, a clash which in the budget debates has penetrated even to the Councils, manned though they are by meek and easily duped Moderates. The more India awakes, the more she aspires, the more she moves to material life, the sharper becomes the conflict between the people and the State. This is quite inevitable. All the sounding words and grandiloquent professions which the rulers may pour forth cannot hide the daily widening chasm nor link together forces fundamentally hostile. In vain they talk of 'training,' of 'trusteeship' or point to railways made

or ordered systems of law. The hard, the essential fact is this. The interest and the will of the people is for freedom ; the interest and the will of the officials is for bondage. You cannot reconcile two contraries.

This then is the heart of India's unrest and the source of the deep fever which tortures her. No people can be happy or peaceful or prosperous with rulers a caste apart, with a Government whose aims conflict with their interests. After all, what is the State ? Is it not, ought it not to be but the executive organ of the people ? Why should it have a life apart or interests apart from the people ? That is the doctrine of kings, who looked on the peoples as created to serve their purpose and fulfil their interests. In the right view the State and the people are one. The rulers are but the servants of the nation to carry out its behests, to accomplish its aims, to make good its progress. The idea that they are wiser is a mere chimera. It is a delusion which has been carefully

fostered and which rulers are careful to maintain by pompous words and a grave demeanour, but all history gives it the lie. Closely examined their wisdom turns out to be selfishness and their foresight folly. What interest have the people but to be free, to be educated, to cultivate each man his land or to carry on each man his trade in peace and happiness. What do they gain by foreign wars but death and misery? What do the gorgeous equipage and enormous salaries of State officials mean but heavy taxes out of their hard earned income?

Let us have done with this pantomime of a State distinct from and above the people. Let the State become as it were but the hands of the people and its officials in very truth, what they now only pretend to be, its servants. Let the latter come down from their pedestals and be as they are in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland one with the people, in the same way as merchants



and professional men are one with them. Then we shall see no more in India the poison of hatred and cruelty, distrust and arrogance amongst officials, nor a people fevered and distressed. Then will peace and good fellowship possess her heart and the high hope of a new life beckon her serenely onwards.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE TURN OF THE WHEEL.

---

The untimely end of Arthur Griffith, the crime of Michael Collins's death, have not unnaturally struck the imagination and partially diverted attention from a remarkable fact in the careers of these two great men. But recently, both were in the eye of the British Law, criminals, yet both loved to govern Ireland, while their deaths were seriously mourned by the British Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary. It was Griffith, the Cavour of Irish Liberty, who first planned a movement of Non-co-operation, Sinn Fein. That strategy he adopted from Deak of Hungary, who in the face of overwhelming odds won his country's independence from Austria. Sinn Fein was inaugurated in 1902, but at first made little headway, as the majority of the Irish led by Redmond, still believed in obtaining Home Rule by co-operation in Parliament. Against

this policy, Sinn Fein declared open war. Arthur Griffith and his followers held that the British Government would never give Home Rule as a boon or favour ; it was to be won only by self-reliance, by themselves alone. Sinn Fein gained ground, especially after Home Rule had been shelved at the beginning of the war, but it was the military executions, following the Easter Rising in 1916 which, outside the four Ulster countries, made it the creed of all Ireland. These executions stung the Irish into a white fury, convinced them once for all, of the madness of begging freedom from such a government. The sequel, the Black-and-Tan terror, and the so-called Treaty of London, are within everybody's recollection.

Of this great movement, Arthur Griffith was the brain. Like Parnell, of a cold demeanour, he shone rather by what he wrote than by what he said. In one paper after another—for as in India the British Government suppressed many papers—he argued,

urged, impelled, the Irish to rely only on themselves. He devised the plan of campaign ; he pointed the road. He organised this Government within a Government.

After the Easter Rising he was arrested, tried and lay for a time under sentence of death. But a dramatic change was in store. Within ten years, the cause he fought for triumphs, he meets the British Premier face to face in London and with him settles a new constitution for Ireland. If this constitution does not realise the hopes for Independence, it at least enables the Irish to live their own life and work out their own destiny. Griffith, once a condemned man, becomes the President of the new Nation. Some seven months later when he dies, the British King and Premier send their condolences ; it is felt as a national loss.

Turn now to Michael Collins, the Garibaldi of Ireland, the most romantic figure in a land rich in heroes and in bold

leaders of forlorn hopes. Like Griffith he joined in the Easter insurrection, being then quite unknown. But he soon won to the front of the Sinn Fein movement and became the Chief of the Irish Republican Army. Tales of his courage, his energy, his daring, and his resourcefulness are on everyone's lips. With many hair-breadth escapes, for the Black-and-Tan had orders to take him dead or alive, he remained in Dublin and conducted with scrupulous exactitude the onerous duties of his post. With Griffith, this whilom outlaw attends the London Conference. Thereafter he not only commands the Free State Army, now a legal and authorised force, but quickly gives evidence of the highest and best statesmanship. Ever he is for conciliation; ever he has before his eyes the vision of a united and prosperous Ireland. In contact with the British and French politicians, who can lead men but to hatred and the tomb, he pointed the Irish to the stars. Had he lived, he would have been the loved leader of

Ireland, the guardian of her destiny for many a year to come. Alas! it was not to be. Yet even at the end, when mortally wounded at the hands of fanatics, he found strength to say "Forgive them;" surely the sublimest words ever uttered by a dying leader.

We have then this remarkable fact that these two men, Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins, who ended by governing Ireland, whose deaths were lamented in England, their erstwhile foe, were but recently the one under sentence of death, the other an outlaw with a price on his head. Their very names were enough to provoke a storm of vituperation in the Capitalist Press and the governing classes of Great Britain. Truly "the stone which the builders rejected, the same has become the head of the corner."

Is not that significant for Indian Nationalists? Does it not sound a message of hope through the darkness of to-day? Does it not presage the time when Indian Leaders, too, men like M. K. Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, C.R. Das.

the Ali Brothers, Motilal Nehru, who to-day eat or have eaten the jail bread, shall rule India, the honoured equals of British statesmen? Surely so. As in Ireland, the day will come, and come far sooner than many now believe possible, when Indians also shall be masters in their own house. A turn of the wheel, and those now in prison will hold the sceptre of power. When that time comes, India, unlike Ireland, having elected to gain liberty through non-violence, will be free to enter on her new life, untroubled by the grim aftermath which civil war must always leave in its train.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE LOST FAITH IN LIBERTY.

---

Dr. Butler, the head of the Columbia University, has come to London and has declared that the Americans have lost faith in liberty. If the imprisonment of Eugene Debs, Larkin and scores of others for political heresy and the persecution of "radicals," *i.e.* of persons whose ideas are obnoxious to the ruling class, be any guide, the present United States Government has views on freedom not dissimilar from those of the mediaeval Popes. Dr. Butler has himself ejected from his university more than one professor whose political views were unorthodox. The revival of the Ku-klux-klan, and the introduction of a marked slavery under the name of 'peonage' indicates the extent of the reaction in the South. In the West the famous writer Upton Sinclair has been arrested for merely reading the American Constitution. Clearly in the opinion of the ruling or capitalist



class all are not entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." If this goes on, some Americans will be asking what was the use of the Civil War. Why not all be slaves together?

In society too, according to Mussolini—whom Lord Curzon delighteth to honour—men are 'tired of freedom.' The nation, says this bourgeois revolutionary, will march forward over her partially decomposed corpse. Certainly Mussolini has the courage of his opinions. To do him justice, he has acted in strict accordance with his belief. The Fascisti have marched, if not forward, at least to power, through murder, arson and terrorism. And being in power they impose their will on the nation in like manner as did its Austrian masters, seventy years ago.

This kind of idea is not confined to Italy or the United States. The ruling classes in France and Britain think and talk in very much the same way. In India the Anglo-Indian press has never had any urgent need

for liberty—quite the contrary in fact. Lord Reading who waxed so eloquent on justice—before he left the shores of England—seems to have overlooked then the call of freedom. He has said nothing since his arrival at Simla to rectify this omission. Perhaps he considers that his acts speak for him.

Just over a century ago, after the battle of Waterloo, Europe went through very much the same phase as now, and for the same reason. This repression is a necessary consequence, an aftermath of war, at least of any general and prolonged war. Itself a reversion to savagery, men learn in warfare to discard the painfully acquired habit of thinking for themselves, they go back to the primitive rule of slavish obedience to the horde and its leader. Mentally they are even as the naked savages of to-day. The fact that 'generals now wear Khaki uniform' and not war paint, or that each side kills the other with poison gas instead of poisoned arrows makes no difference. This regression into

barbarism, though so easy to make, is difficult to eradicate. The mental habits acquired in war persist long after the war—a fact which astute capitalists in every country have been quick to turn to their advantage.

All then that Dr. Butler and Mussolini affirm is that the nigger mind has—with their entire approval—descended upon the United States and upon Italy. That is no compliment to the Americans and Italians, but, since both countries own strong armies and fleets, they doubtless know their own business best. Some may regret that the countrymen of Washington should imitate the methods of Papal Rome and may realise that your country does not become free merely by planting a statue of Liberty in front of your principal port. Nor can one imagine Mazzini or Garibaldi describing liberty as a putrid corpse.

After all, what do Anglo-Indians or any other ruling class intend when they scoff at freedom? Do they wish that their own

lives should be ordered and controlled, that education or want of education, peace or war, their fiscal system, every thing in fact on which the life of the country depends, should be settled not as they will but in the interest of another? Do they repudiate freedom for themselves? Not at all. With the Government, so to speak, in their pockets, they are, whatever its form, freemen. These men, whether under Indian or Italian or American skies, propose the same thing, freedom for themselves, chains for the other classes. Is not that a mean kind of freedom? Is it not selfish? To trample on others, to draw one's own wealth and comfort from their degradation, what is this but the ethics of the slave-holder, of the Roman landlord or the Virginian planter? They too claimed liberty for themselves, but denied it to their fellows, and in due course their doom was upon them. The chains, may not be here, the whip, the branding iron, but bayonets and bombs in like manner take their toll of human flesh.

No society, whatever its form, whether frankly despotic or hiding under a specious facade the sinister framework of the jail, can long endure which denies liberty to the many in order that the few may lord it in power and in wealth. Like a great timber bulk, ant-eaten within, it will crash into ruin when men least expect it. Now wake the fettered peoples. The word goes forth and can never again be smothered that an unfree man is a man stunted, stupified, robbed of his birth-right. That fact once grasped, what subject people will ever rest until the barriers are down?

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

### ALL POWER TO WEALTH!

---

The real peril before India is not a continuance of bureaucratic rule, but government by organised wealth. True, under diarchy, the officials have their way very much as under the Morley constitution, but signs are not wanting that this is merely a passing phase, and that the officials will become more and more agents to the great business combines, which direct the affairs of the world and, in particular, the affairs of Great Britain.

Diarchy, it will be noted, is in effect designed to this end. The high franchise, the special representation given to men representing big firms and above all the Council of State, a body obviously framed on the analogy of that stronghold of wealth, the House of Lords, all betray the unconscious mind of its founders. Given time, it will result in enacting the same system

which prevails in Western Europe and the United States—a system which has produced one World War and is now cheerfully preparing for an even more gigantic slaughter. India has looked and still looks to spiritual rather than material ends, but the machine is there, and as the years roll by, it will surely mould Indian thought, with slow but inevitable steps to the world out-look desired by the Big Business. Of that, there can be no doubt, whatever.

The growing power of the Tata Company, the Bombay mill interests, and the tea, jute and coal interests in Bengal must be apparent to most Indians. In Burma we have the federating of the Soan States, not at the request of the Chiefs or the people, but obviously in order to facilitate the operations of British capital in that area. As a rule, when the interests of the British and Indian capital clash, the former, with its controlling influence in London, will triumph. The revision of the cotton duties was an exception, but that was probably due to the need.

in order to counter the popular agitation in India of winning over, on the official side, the mere important Indian capitalists. But whether Indian or British, capitalists always sink their differences, when it is a question of wealth against the people. That is abundantly clear in the attitude of the newspapers in England, representing different trusts, in the conflicts with labour, and especially in the concerted action of the capitalist Governments against Russia, the one country where the workers rule.

It is natural that the more liberal-minded officials should believe that they are introducing democracy in India. They believe that they have democracy in England. Of course, if you hold that the counting of noses, at wide intervals, means that the people govern, England may be said to have that form of Government. But you have to look at the mind, the ideas behind these noses. Who forms these ideas? Who furnishes the facts or makes the suggestion



which determines the voters' opinions. In England for centuries, though there was a farcical pretence at elections, the feudal landlords ruled and the people were quite content that they should rule. Why? Because it had been pumped into them from their childhood, by the Church and by other agencies, that the landlords were a superior class, who alone knew the art of Government and alone could prevent disaster and guide the nation to glory and prosperity. In Russia, for centuries, the Czars ruled with the entire approval of 999 out of 1000 Russians, who, by precisely the same agencies were brought up to believe in the superhuman wisdom and love of the "Little Father." Suggestions made in childhood or repeated constantly during adult-life have, it must be remembered, an amazing power over the human intellect. At hypnotism most people look askance and with reason, but they quite overlook the fact that waking suggestion is almost equally powerful. Only the more independent or brave men and women,

can quite be free from suggestions made during childhood. This fact, the Church has well known how to utilise ; hence the Jesuit saying " give me a child until he is seven, and I do not care what you teach him afterwards." Suggestions made with confidence and authority sway the minds of millions never trained to question and to think. When constantly repeated, even if the conscious mind rejects them at first, they end in finding acceptance. This was the reason behind the daily repetition in the " Daily Mail " of the phrase " Take Care of Those Huns ; They Will Cheat You Yet." It also explained such advertisements as " Welsher's Soap is the Best."

Though the Church's power is swiftly declining, such as it is, its influence is as ever at the disposal of the powers, that be ; in this case of the capitalists. The morality of the schools is entirely theirs. But the supreme weapon at their disposal is the daily newspaper, with its falsehoods, its conceal-

ments and its shameless perversion of political events. By the Millionaire Press, organised wealth moulds the minds of the people, as the potter his clay, and manipulates to its own purposes their trust and their simplicity. Voting is an empty form, when the minds of the voters are saturated with fictions and false suggestions. As the suppression of the Secret Treaties and the Nationalization of Women canard prove, no concealment can be too outrageous, and no lie too fantastic to find millions of dupes amongst a people, which takes its ideas from the modern newspaper. In spite of elections or rather through elections, capital rules with as firm a sceptre as the landlords under George I, the nobles under the Czar, or for that matter, the Pope in the former Papal States. Pope or Capitalism, what matters the name, so long as the governing power shapes the minds of the people ?

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### EQUAL RIGHTS AND EQUAL DUTIES.

---

Not only to the wealthy but to the poorest pariah, the humblest drudge Swaraj should bring blessings beyond rubies. The English Reform Act of 1832 was a revolution only for the middle classes; Indian : waraj means, should mean,—ought to mean,—a revolution for all, but especially for the poor. Because the great mass of Indians have as yet toiled long hours, because their wages as yet only suffice for meagre meals and hovels unfit for cattle, because they and their children are uneducated, is no reason why these wrongs—for they are wrongs—should be perpetual like the sun and stars. When the big landlords governed England, the common folk then suffered equal wrongs. Now that landlord rule is over, the English though not yet really free, for they are ruled by capitalists, have purged themselves of the

grosser iniquities of the old thralldom. These evils are not inherent in the nature of things. They are born, just as rotten wood begets maggots, from a bad system of Government and from the selfishness of a class.

Wherever educated and ignorant live together, the latter tend to become the slaves of the former. Therefore the first and supreme reform under Swaraj must be universal education. There is another reason. The children belong to India, and India demands an intelligent and intellectual population. The drastic reductions which Government by the people will make possible in the army estimates, can of themselves provide the school establishments needed. Like Canada or Australia, the Indian government, resting on the people, purged of lust for foreign conquest, will need but few troops for internal order. For school buildings India can have recourse to a loan. Capitalist nations never hesitate to raise loans in order to make war on others *i.e.*, in order

to slaughter men and seize their country. Why should not self-governing India borrow money in order to enlighten her people and make them happier and better ?

Reduce salaries, especially in the higher grades, and further vast sums will be set free for the benefit of the common folk. Under Swaraj it should not be necessary to bribe men heavily in order to induce them to serve their country. A spirit of self-sacrifice, of zeal for the public good will inspire the Government service. To foreigners the idea of self-sacrifice for India makes no appeal, but it will be otherwise when India governs herself. The shining examples of Mahatma Gandhi, C. R. Das, Motilal Nehru and a host of others make that as certain as next Christmas. These further sums may be spent either on promoting public health or in reduction of taxation as the people think fit.

But except for the salt-tax, which ought never to have been imposed, there can be no reduction unless and until the poorest children

in the land are enabled to read and write and develop their minds. Before everything, education. And the education mark you, must differ as day from night from that now doled out in the sparsely scattered schools. In the first place, it will be Indian, instinct with the Indian thought and history, illumined by stories of Indian heroes. In the second place, it must teach boys and girls to think. Present education only does that to a limited extent. The officials, if they would retain their power, cannot encourage real freedom of thought. No governing class ever has, or will tolerate this, for freedom of thought is a sharp axe to cut away the whole foundation of their governance. Think clearly, and at once the artificial barriers which confine the people, the fetters which hold them down, are revealed in all their naked selfish greed, as a system under which :—

“ One half of the world must sweat and groan,

“ That the other half may dream.”

With Swaraj let India bid an eternal goodbye to this world of division, of injustice, of cruelty. With her people associated on equal terms, working together in fellowship for the good of all, India will be transfigured. No man can then set bounds to her progress or to her glory in all that makes for civilization and human brotherhood.

With equal opportunities to be men, Indians may very well become more than men. They may rise to heights beyond the wildest dreams of present-day patriots. In intellect, in ethics and in freedom from militarism, have they not already a notable advantage over blood-soaked Europe?

Nor should material gains be wanting in the new India. The miracles of modern science, the teeming products of ingenious machinery, no longer reserved as now for a selfish few, may become the heritage of all. None shall lack whilst some surfeit.



Be very sure that equal rights and equal opportunities is no windy phrase, no pictured bliss to be realised in the skies. It means benefits real and tangible, benefits to be realised here and now. That is what the people must understand. If they only will it, as Mahatma Gandhi has a hundred times declared, the old order with its ignorance and injustice, must fade away as an evil dream of the night that is gone. As yet they lack the will because they lack the knowledge of all that Swaraj will bring to them. They cannot imagine that no man is so humble but that, given knowledge and inspiration, he may become a Socrates, a Shakespeare, a Mazzini or a Darwin. Yet it is strictly and literally true. India to-day is an engine of 1000 horse power working at the power of one.

Now are the doors of knowledge locked. Swaraj will fling them open. For Swaraj based on equal rights and equal duties, is no mere change of matter. It is for India's millions that gateway into a new world.

All whom a common faith knits together, those who strive towards the one goal of freedom, who fight under the standard of equal rights, these clearly have each of them the same duty. Every Indian Nationalist is bound by the ideals which inspire him to wage war not for himself or for his class but for all. He looks to see a free India, an equal India. Such an India is not to be won by the zeal of a single class or section ; it can spring only from the will and deeds of the whole people. Therefore upon each one, whether landlord or capitalist, shop-keeper or artisan, peasant or labourer, is laid the same duty, a duty which none can avoid without shame or loss of self-respect. As the honeycomb, is built up by the intelligence and labour of all the bees, so does " New India " depend on the devotion of all her sons.

It were otherwise, were a small class seeking to clutch to itself the fruits of freedom. Thus it was that old Rome fell. The vast

majority were slaves to a few wealthy landlords or capitalists, and when the northern barbarians stormed at their gates, they would not fight for the country which was for them no mother but a cruel tyrant. Let the wealthy and the educated of India fight for a nobler aim than that. Let them aim for a state where each citizen has the same right to education and to be a man or woman, where none go naked while others wanton in luxury. So will they enlist the passionate loyalty of the toilers and the oppressed in the battle for India's liberty. None are so terrible in combat, so resolute to conquer or so stubborn in their cause as they who fight for an equal freedom. That was the secret of the victory of the Puritans over King Charles' Cavaliers. That was why the Swiss won their liberty from the Austrians who out-numbered them by ten to one. Each man is spurred on by a sense of duty. He feels himself to be a knight contending in a great cause. He understands the retort of the Greek to Persian General "If you

know what freedom was, you would fight for it not with the spear only, but with the axe."

This sense of duty is a chain of steel to grapple together the scattered units and the multifarious classes of a vast people. Leaders may rise and fall, tactics may alter, the battle cry of one autumn may lose all force in the next spring. All great struggles have their phases. Periods of fierce enthusiasm are followed by dim twilights where doubt and dismay show their evil faces. Never has liberty been won by mere demand and argument, as one wins a case at law. But in the long-drawn struggle, in the hot onset as well as in the chilling prayer it is the sense of individual duty which makes those invincible who contend for a free and national life. This it is that has stood the English in good stead in their many contests, with tyrant kings or a selfish nobility. The oppressor may threaten or cajole, he may seek to divide or to

entice sections of the people to his own side. Such has been the common strategy of despots from ancient Assyria down through the tormented ages even till the present day in India. But against the impenetrable shield of a common sense of duty a despot's utmost violence is foiled and his most cunning wiles prove fruitless. He may threaten, he may imprison, he may make false promises and seek to deceive by empty boons. The people animated by duty, smile at the one, and reject the other. Each individual feels himself in honour bound to go forward on the road marked out for all. To separate himself seems an act of disloyalty to his comrades, a cowardice.

Comradeship, with its keen sense of duty gives superhuman energy to peoples struggling to be free. How else would the French after their revolution have hurled back the embattled kings of Europe, or the Russians routed the well-armed troops sent against them by the capitalist Governments? That

is the supreme virtue of this equality of rights. Honesty boldly proclaimed as the creed of a people it inspires all with an iron sense of duty. It sweeps away the dark and chilling traditions of the past. It opens out the vision of a new world, a world of fellowship and hope. Generosity begets generosity. Trust inspires loyalty. The plainest man, the poorest worker arises and strides forward, shoulder to shoulder with his fellows, a hero to the battle.

## CHAPTER XV.

### REMOVAL OF UNTOUCHABILITY.

---

By the decision of the Committee of the National Congress, India has recognised—and none too soon—that disunion paralyses a national movement. When two sections of a fighting force are employed not so much in an assault on the common foe as on a cross fire, each against each, that army will not go forward. On the contrary the enemy, if he is intelligent, will seize the opportunity to press home a counter-attack and to recover lost ground. That is what has happened in many famous wars, and it is precisely what has happened in the present struggle for freedom. The bureaucracy in July 1923 is in a vastly stronger position than that which it occupied in January 1922.

A great obstacle has been removed and that first condition of success a united front—if not attained, is yet in sight. But is that enough? Are there not still deep

sources of weakness in the Indian forces ? Everyone knows that there are two ; Hindu-Moslem disunity and Untouchability. No one realised this more clearly than Mahatma Gandhi ; it was a chief part of his work to break down these barriers against Swaraj. Despite certain happenings in the Punjab, the first barrier will probably soon be down. It is a waning evil. Comradeship in a common cause, the same hope faith and patriotism will and must breed toleration for difference in religious beliefs. They have brought toleration in Europe and they will do so in India. The second barrier, the untouchability, is more subtle in its strength, because less obvious to the public eye. All papers chronicle a religious riot, but many ignore the yawning chasm which cuts off so great a host of Indians , from the common life. But it exists and bars the way. "There can be no Swaraj without the removal of untouchability " said the Mahatma, and he did not exaggerate.'



Happily both sections of the Congress are now free to work for this, as for other items of the constructive programme. May we not hope that the energy recently spent in a strife between brothers will now be devoted to the nobler aim—Mahatma Gandhi's aim, of purging India of this bane to her national life and thus adding a thousand legions to her strength !

It is not only in number that the cause will gain. It will gain even more in force and in spirit. The idea of equality, of which untouchability is the extremist denial, has again and again been a magic talisman to turn soldiers into heroes. Take the English Civil War or freedom against the tyrant Charles I. In all Cromwell's famous army no grimmer fighters were there than the Levellers, whose doctrines history has traduced, but who aimed at a true democracy and hoped to make England a paradise not for a class but for all. This same idea of equality coupled with freedom transformed

the French for a score of years after 1792.. Under the Bourbons, with their tyrannical nobles and their privileged priests the French made passable soldiers, who were sometimes victorious but more frequently lost battles. After the Revolution they became for a time masters of Europe. In Russia, but yesterday, the workers and peasants, inspired by the same two ideas, achieved the impossible. The Czars and Kerensky had left the country in ruins exhausted by war, destitute of munitions, with its railways, factories, everything disorganised. In this desperate plight the capitalist Governments hurled against the Republic the troops of Dennikin, Koltchak and other adventurers equipped with every modern implement for the slaughter of men. All that money, lavishly expended, could do, was supplied. Yet, so great is the power of these two ideas, equality and freedom, that the Russians routed each of the White Armies in turn and defied the capitalists exactly as 130

years before, the French Republicans defeated the embattled kings of Europe.

To achieve freedom India has chosen a nobler, and a cleaner path, than by the sword. But whether on the battle-field or in the bloodless struggle by peaceful weapons, this principle of equality holds good. It has the same virtue in one sense as in the other. To make men do their utmost, you must hold up before their eyes the sacred banner, not only of freedom but of equality. Then only do you bring into play your whole strength. You astonish not only your enemies but yourselves. Your forces become terrible in their might. It is no longer an army of drilled men, moving at command; it is an army of Ironsides who will never know defeat. No need to search for leaders. If one is imprisoned a dozen are fit to take his place. Each man is, as it were, a leader, for, each rises to the full height of his being, like a torrent of lava; such an army moves forward to its goal, laughing at obstacles, irresistible because inspired.

Such a force will India have? To-day, India fights in a holy cause, but with one hand tied behind her back. Remove untouchability and you double her forces, you more than double her spirit.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### LEADERS OF LABOUR.

---

Indian Nationalists and the English Labour Party wage a parallel warfare. In each country power is in the hands of a small class with military traditions supported by an army the officers of which are either of that class or wholly devoted to it, whilst the men are permeated by loyalty to it. In each country education is coloured in the interests of the ruling class. In each the people fight, at home for equal opportunities to lead a good life, abroad, for a foreign policy based, not on banditry, but on the comradeship of nations. The two countries differ in this, that in England the ruling class, forced to give votes to the people, holds powers mainly by drugging their minds by means of the capitalist press. In India, the ruling class is foreign, though supported by Indian landlords and capitalists, and it rests its power more nakedly on the Army.

But in essentials the issues are much the same. Indian eyes may therefore follow with interest the tactics of English labour, finding in them here something to follow, there something to shun.

Take for example the recent annual conference at Queen's Hall, London. The President, Mr. Sidney Webb, is well-known for his historical researches into social conditions and local administration in England. The Presidential address was hailed by many members as the speech of a statesman. Was it really such? Few will deny his assertions that capitalism is passing from competition to monopoly, that the French occupation of the Ruhr is a disaster for Europe, that both Conservatives and Liberals are barren of leaders. These are commonplaces for all who think. But to call the Treaty of Versailles "inefficient" is mere clumsiness. You may say that a man or a machine is inefficient, but not a treaty, least of all the crime of Versailles. Still more absurd was

it to ascribe the perpetration of that crime to ignorance. No doubt, as Professor Keynes pointed out, Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau were crassly ignorant of political economy, but the evil they wrought was not due to such ignorance. It was due to lack of any moral principle in them and their backers higher than that of a wolf pack in the division of its quarry. England, under Mr. Lloyd George, snatched at the German merchant fleet and colonies, whilst France under the guise of fantastic "reparations" aimed at the total destruction of Germany and the seizure of Ruhr coal, her object from the beginning. Mr. Sydney Webb has clearly not learnt the A B C of foreign politics.

Turning to home affairs, he was at pains to point out that socialism could only come by slow, by very slow, degrees. First, the Socialists would have to gain a majority in the House of Commons and even then they could only advance inch by inch. Each bill would have to be hammered out with

care through committees and each one when passed would take time to execute. Hence in his pedantic language "the inevitability of gradualness cannot fail to be appreciated." Strangely enough Mr. Webb overlooked the House of Lords which would surely veto every Socialist bill. To override this veto would, even granting the Socialists remained in power, require another two years. Hence, more "gradualness." Was ever a more chilling speech delivered to a host hot for great reforms, suffering deep wrongs and impetuous for a finer life? Let us make haste slowly. Let us argue and persuade against the whole weight of the capitalist press putting forth measures tentatively and by degrees passing them into law in spite of the House of Lords. At best you will only have piecemeal legislation. Perhaps a century hence—who knows?—you may with luck achieve Socialism? The fact is Mr. Sidney Webb was not talking to Labour. He was talking to the middle class, the bourgeoisie. He wishes to soothe them; to



explain that the Socialist bogey is after all a bleating lamb.

One thing is certain, that as long as the Labour Party elect leaders like Mr. Webb or Mr. Clynes—Mr. Clynes headed the poll for this year's executive—they are marching to ultimate defeat. For a party which aims at a new social system, a new and nobler social order, you must have "vision, enthusiasm, courage." What kind of spirit will be left after speeches like Mr. Webb's? Will men dare and do for the chance of piecemeal reforms slowly achieved after long years of suffering and of agitation? It was hardly necessary for Mr. Macdonald to rebuke certain members for "demonstration of heroics" to the subject races of the Empire. With leaders such as these little of heroical will be left in the Labour Party. Already it belies the high promise of the General Election. No wonder it fails to support its only paper, the "Daily Herald." No wonder the membership of Trade Unions is less by one-fourth than two years ago.

We may see here at work the same timidity which produces the Moderates in India today, which produced them yesterday in Ireland and half a century ago in Italy, under the Austrian yoke. To achieve a great object—be it political freedom or a new social system—you must keep that object ever before the eyes of the people. You must point them to a direct and short road. So only will you sustain their spirit, so only will you kindle their courage. Turn their eyes to minor reforms *e.g.* rent control in England or, in India, education—and you play into the hands of the ruling class. Throughout history, it has ever been the tactics of such a class to divert the attention of the peoples from their misery or their impotence; it holds up some other matter of interest—a war, a petty boon or a pageantry. This diversion of interest is precisely what the rulers want. Whatever the allurements of other ports, keep the great ship of the people headed straight for her destined harbour. Never lose grip on fundamentals. By that way alone have nations won freedom.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE BOLSHEVIST BOGEY.

---

Recently it was discovered at Simla that more "red" gold was being spent in India and that the sinister subverters of law and order were again at work. But is not this scare a little overdone? Wherever there is a serious strike, wherever the subjects of the capitalist government become at all fractious, there, we are assured, Bolshevik gold is being lavished. We have heard of it in India and in Afghanistan. We have heard of it in East Africa and in South Africa. We have heard of it in England, in Ireland, in France and in Italy. We have heard of it most of all in the United States. The next time the Hottentots refuse to pay taxes, the Bolsheviks must have incited them. Probably when the Papuans of New Guinea drive off the missionary the Bolsheviks will have had a finger in the pie. As the Frenchman said, this kind of thing ends by becoming monotonous. After another

three years of it, even Lord Sydenham and the readers of the "Morning Post" may begin to doubt or, if that is not possible, to become a little bored. As any editor of the (late) Northcliffe Press could tell the propaganda departments—we beg pardon—the publicity bureaus of the various Governments, it is sound business to occasionally vary your stunt. Is it not time that the Bolshevik bogey was given a rest? In its place, as the cause of the next big strike or outbreak of "unrest," the bureau concerned might come out with some such stunt as "The Example of Early Christian Communists" or "The Sins of Sun Yet Sen."

Consider, too, the matter of dignity. Here we have wealthy governments, armed governments, strong in their own rectitude and in the possession of unlimited cash, aeroplanes, bombs, high explosives, machine guns, tanks, quick firers, poison gas, mustard gas, superdreadnoughts, destroyers, cruisers, submarines, in fact every argument that the

wit of man can devise—yet they tremble (figuratively) in their shoes at the mere suspicion of these emissaries of the Red Revolution. At the name of Moscow they cackle like so many hens when a terrier barks. Nobility it has been said imposes obligation—noblesse oblige—and governments which have made the world safe for democracy and which are zealously working in the cause of civilization to convert the natives of Mesopotomia, Syria, Haiti and other wild places—such governments ought to despise the machinations of these ill-bred communists. A gentleman disdains to notice the scurrilities of the vulgar, and what are these governments, if they are not governments of gentlemen?

Again, there is an unfortunate parallel to the modern plan of penalising Bolshevik speeches or literature. Five hundred years ago in Europe they 'were doing something very similar. For 'state' write 'church,' and for 'Communism' 'heresy,' and the picture

was indeed just the same. Everywhere the church saw heresy ; everywhere to utter anything heretical was a criminal offence ; heretics were interned, banished and punished in many unpleasant ways. True, burning alive is no longer done in the best government circles, and rack, thumbscrew boot, and breaking at the wheel have become as obsolete as match-lock muskets. But the governments still imprison for quite long periods those who differ from them in too marked a degree. In the United States some eighty citizens are in custody for terms running to 10 or 20 years for doubting the particular lies published by their Government as to the causes and aims of the war. In India many thousands have enjoyed the hospitality of Government for saying they would have nothing to do with the Government. All capitalist Ministries have imprisoned communists. No doubt this proves the communists to be very wrong, but are there not better methods demonstrating this fact, methods less 'sugges-

tive of the Church when suppressing those naughty heretics of the Middle Ages ?

For instance why not allow open debates ? If Bolshevism is so very immoral and sinful, it should be quite easy to prove its depravity, just as one proves the depravity of drink or of cannibalism. Forbidden fruit is always tempting and if the governments are so very strict to taboo everything the Bolsheviks say, we shall have our young men and maidens going round to find out what are these terrible doctrines, the mere utterance of which is a sin, the publication of which is a crime. Why not let the Bolsheviks say what they think of Capitalism quite as openly as the capitalists can now say what they think of Bolshevism ? It would liven up the dull moments when the Coalition Government and M. Poincaré are not starting a new war or a new crisis. Bolshevism may be very wrong but the plain man would like to have it proved wrong, and proved it cannot be, until the Bolsheviks have had a

fair hearing. It is possible that capitalism and communism may be each partly right and partly wrong. It is even possible that they may be both wrong. St. Bernard *Chau* wrote "you never can tell." But it is not



## CHAPTER XVIII.

### THE BROTHERHOOD OF INDIA.

---

Every one has heard of the marvellous coral islands of the Pacific. These structures, built by the labour of countless myriads of coral insects, form permanent land on which men live and work and cultivate in complete security. Or again, as in the Great Barrier Reef of Australia, these insects have thrown up a breakwater, 1,000 miles long which defies the utmost fury of the crashing ocean surges. Yet the insect itself is an insignificant creature, fragile, easily crushed. What enables it to raise these stupendous ramparts? Surely its perfect singleness of aim, the union of all without exception for the common end. Does any one suppose that, if a large proportion of the coral insects rested in illness, or worse, even hindered the task

of building, reefs and islands would arise in the teeth of the breakers and the strong sea currents ?

Cannot this lowly being furnish a lesson to the lordly race of men ? Look back through the long vistas of history. How many millions upon millions of human beings have suffered ignorance and poverty and toil in order that some small class might enjoy not only plenty but a debasing luxury. For them to work, for us to enjoy, such has been the end of selfish governing classes from the dim dawn of civilisation in Babylon and Egypt through the Empire of the Greeks and Romans, in a thousand lands under every sky, down to the present day. Once it was chattel slavery, now, as in Western Europe, America, China and Japan it is wage slavery. What matters, the name ? 'The principle of misery for the many,' delights for the few is just the same.

The tragedy lies in this ; that all those hosts of slaves and down-trodden people

who have so suffered through the ages, could at any time have freed themselves, could have stepped out of the hell they lived in to what would have relatively been paradise, had they only conceived and acted on the idea of the union and work of all, without exception, for the good of all. One great effort all together, and their chains would have fallen clanking to the earth. But they believed that as it had been, so it would always be, that what their fathers had borne, they also must bear. They were duped by the governing classes, told that they were by nature inferior, unfit to rule, capable only of the baser callings. They have been kept in ignorance, selfishly and wickedly kept in ignorance. Small sections of them have been bought or cajoled to serve the governing class against their fellows. Divisions amongst them have been fostered and artificially provoked. When a few have risen up to redress intolerable wrongs or to demand a fuller life, as Wat Tyler and John Ball in mediæval England, or the Chartists of eighty

years ago, the many, even those who understood and sympathised, have stood coldly by, and allowed the pioneers of freedom to be crushed by the hard forces of their masters. They were slaves because they willed to be slaves, because, unlike the coral insects, they knew not the secret of their strength, the union of all for the good of all.

To turn to India, if there was one truth which Mahatma Gandhi was never tired of preaching, which he repeated daily again and again, it was just this, that India can have Swaraj to-morrow, if only all Indians unite for it and do a few acts, quite lawful and simple acts, within the competence of each-for that end. All that is required of them is a little faith, a little sacrifice and that perfect unity of work by which the tiny coral insect accomplished its miracles. No Indian can plead ignorance of this simple fact, for the words of Mahatma are known throughout all towns and have penetrated to the farthest villages hidden in the moun-

tain forests. Yet still the untouchables suffer and Hindu-Muhammadian unity is even now not quite complete. Many are apathetic. They will not even make the small sacrifice involved in wearing "Khaddar." As Kipling wrote :—"Gardens are not made, by singing 'Oh How Beautiful' and sitting in shade." Not even the most pacific revolution can be accomplished by merely wishing. You have got to act. You have got to rouse the sluggard, inspire the coward, wake from their fool's paradise those who dream that a privileged class will ever be reasoned out of power. In all the world's history that has never once happened. The Moderates must be shown the error of their ways and rallied to their country's cause, those Moderates so pliant in principle so cringing to their overlords, resolute only in their clutch on office.

By the work of all together in good will and fellowship for the common end which all have at heart, not only will Swaraj be

near at hand but to-morrow a new India will rise up cemented by the bonds of freedom and equality and patriotism, strong as the coral reefs to resist the on-coming waves of capitalism and the under-currents of class-selfishness. India can and will march to victory. And it will be to the music of brothers all, of equal rights and equal happiness.

**THE END.**

# IS INDIA A CONQUERED COUNTRY ? AND IF SO, WHAT THEN ?

VERBATIM REPORT OF A SPIRIT-STIRRING  
DEBATE.

---

PRICE NINE ANNAS ONLY.

---

## SOME PRESS OPINIONS :

We strongly recommend a perusal of this pamphlet  
—(*"The Voice of India."*)

Though the debate reprinted here took place as early as 1870, it can be read with fresh interest even after the lapse of so many years, for the points made by the lecturer, Major Evans Bell, and the speakers who followed him—including Mr. Ngwroji Furdoonji of Bombay—have still not been satisfactorily settled. The debate eminently deserved to be reprinted.—(*"United India and Indian States."*)

This important pamphlet, published as it is at a time when Indians are taking a lively interest in the political affairs of their country apart from their daily bread and butter, deserves to be carefully read and digested by them.—(*"The Kaiser-i-Hind."*)

**SUNSHINE PUBLISHING HOUSE**

ENGINEER BUILDING, QUEENESS STREET, BOMBAY.

# HOME AND THE SCHOOL

## THE STORY OF INDIAN LIFE AND EDUCATION

BY PROF. M. M. GIDVANI, M.A.,

DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION (LONDON).

---

Price Re. 1/8 only.

---

### SOME PRESS OPINIONS :

Mr. M. M. Gidvani is an educational expert. He has had experience of school life outside India and as a teacher in this country has been brought into close act with the cramping system of Indian school life. His small volume is refreshing reading. It is written with vigour, knowledge and insight. Mr. Gidvani properly points out that our school has no relation to the streams of Indian culture, that Indian history is not visualised by pageants, dramas and pictorial representations, that <sup>2</sup> rasa lilas and school celebrations are not encouraged. It is only by basing itself on the forces of our social heritage that education can become a live force in the country. Mr. Gidvani points this out. The book is well printed and got up.—(*"Swarajya."*) , . .



Prof. Gidvani's book makes as gay reading as his previous works. He finds that the inability to speak out is what is wrong with Indians. He asks, "Where has the slave-mentality, so popularly talked about now, its first birth? In the schools, with the child's first 'Yes, Sir', tame and timid. Repression in India begins not with the Black Act but with the Black Board.—(*"The Times of India."*)

Prof. Gidvani has produced a thoughtful book full of suggestions for the remodelling of our educational system in accordance with the higher ideals of culture. He pleads for a bold innovation, a peaceful revolt against the manifold evils of present-day educational custom, which he summarises under parent-craft, priest-craft, teacher-craft and caste-craft.—(*"The Hindu."*)

The present writer is out as a missionary to spread and to work out the new ideas which have been developed by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Montessori, and other modern representatives of their methods. The neglect of the child and of child psychology in the system of education is a crime on the part of the state, the teacher and the parents. It must be remedied. This alone will save Indian youths and hence India socially, politically and economically.—(*"The Bombay Chronicle."*)

**SUNSHINE PUBLISHING HOUSE**

ENGINEER BUILDING, PRINCESS STREET, BOMBAY.

FOURTH EDITION WILL SHORTLY  
BE OUT OF

## **Advanced Accounts**

(A manual of Advanced Accounting for Indian students,  
Accountants, Book-keepers and Businessmen)

By JAMSHED R. BATLIBOI, F.S.A.A. (LONDON).

Price Rs. 12/8 only.

Though Advanced Accounts is a dry subject with no heart-interest in it, still Mr. J. R. Batliboi has so vivified it with his lively spirit and has made it so interesting and informing that the book has endeared itself to the heart of the student population of the commercial colleges of India.

---

**SUNSHINE PUBLISHING HOUSE**

ENGINEER BUILDING, PRINCESS STREET, BOMBAY.

# BEAUTIFUL SETS OF BOOKS FOR LIBRARIES.

We have a few complete and beautiful  
sets of the famous

## Mysteries of the Court of London

By G. W. M. REYNOLDS.

Each set—privately printed for the members of the  
Oxford Society—contains ten illustrated, original and  
unexpurgated volumes, comprising twenty parts in all,  
and is neatly bound in buckram. The sets are in perfect  
condition with gilt edges and uncut pages.

---

Price Rs. 100/- per set.

---

**SUNSHINE PUBLISHING HOUSE**

ENGINEER BUILDING, PRINCESS STREET, BOMBAY.

